

LEHI CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Minutes from the Lehi City Planning Commission Meeting held on Thursday, July 28, 2011 in the Lehi City Council Chambers.

Members Present: Kerry Schwartz, Ed James, Carolyn Nelson, Marilyn Schiess, Janys Hutchings, Derek Byrne, Carolyn Player

Members Absent: Kordel Braley - excused

Others: Christie Hutchings, Kim Struthers, Noreen Edwards, Brad Kenison, Council member Mark Johnson, Council woman Kay Collins, Lorin Powell

Meeting began at 7:01 p.m.

4.3 MOUNTAIN HOME DEVELOPMENT – REQUESTS CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION FOR TRAVERSE MOUNTAIN PLANNED COMMUNITY, AN APPROXIMATE 2,700 ACRE MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 3940 NORTH TRAVERSE MOUNTAIN BLVD. IN AN EXISTING PLANNED COMMUNITY ZONE. (Continued from July 14, 2011)

Christie Hutchings said that this item was tabled from the last meeting as well. Traverse Mountain has submitted some new concepts.

Kim Struthers said that he did hand out all emails or public comments that have come in since the last meeting. We also have the parks and open space analysis that was requested and the new concept plan.

Jack Hepworth was present for the request and stated that since we last met we have had 2 meetings. We did accomplish a few things. He said it was unclear the way the canyon area was designated and he went through the clarification to the process. It didn't change any of the numbers but it is the same as the city development code. He said they changed the corresponding planning areas to correlate with the summary. He said there were concerns expressed about single ownership; renting properties. We clarified that West Canyon and Central Canyon are 'no rent' zones. There are a few other parcel pointed out that are also a 'no rent' zone. Jack pointed out the areas where renting would be allowed. There was also brought up in the meetings that it wasn't clear about the Center Canyon flex area. The note says not to exceed 500 homes and the concern was that we could transfer densities from another area so we made it clear that we wouldn't be able to exceed that amount and the Perry property will not exceed 968 units. The flex area needed some definition. Part of the Perry parcel is flex the other is HDR. He said that the idea with flex is to give flexibility in zoning – clustering or traditional single family detached environment.

Ed James asked where the other 200 units went.

Jack Hepworth said the other 200 could transfer, but if there is a density transfer we will not exceed the 6024 units. This does exclude the 1000 units in the Highway Commercial area which no longer exist. We vested with 7982 units and we have gone down by about 1900 units. We are requesting that the 27 acres be allowed to be a commercial flex area which can be a combination of commercial and residential. With the HDR and/or Commercial – what we mean is - why not do it as an overlay zone not to exceed 546 units. If we end up cutting that in half then the density is more like 40 units per acre. We want to keep the prime frontage as commercial. We would have to do another amendment for that area if we changed it. We were asked to identify the parks as private vs. public and we have done that. In the canyons all the

parks are private with the exception of 9 acres for now being identified as public. He pointed out the others that would be private or public. He said they were asked to look at possible parcels for civic uses. In our meetings with the city and residents – Lorin identified for us that the city currently owns a piece of property for a Fire Station. The City currently has a water tank and this property would be between the water tank and the Frontage Road. This would also be for future detention. We also had a lot of discussion on the 6.5 acres; so we wondered about a recreation facility or other public use but we would like the City to buy that property if it would be used for a civic use. There will be a full traffic study and analysis done so that the concept plan gets everyone on the same page. It's important that we understand where the densities can go so we can do that analysis. We looked at areas for additional active park space, which the residents want to see. We would take care of the grading for the one piece with the current grading so we added 9.1 acres of additional park space; this identifies 67.4 acres of active-park. The park space does include the Perry homes piece. The calcs include the Perry Homes flex area which could have public or private parks space. The lower part of the Perry piece would have private amenities. There is a 1/3 acre recreation area in the approved townhome site and in the 344 apartments there is an acre. Those have also been included in the calcs. He said we also received feedback that we should reinforce the current concept that states we should use the Flight Park Road for exporting. He said we did shrink the developable footprint in the canyons and we are not doing any export in the Central or East Canyons. In note 6 regarding Central Canyon, it talks about why we didn't identify any active parks there. Also relating to Kordel's comment – we were also asked to look at some potential parcels to outline some commercial space. The brokers are not comfortable that they will survive up in the neighborhoods we are more comfortable with those uses down in the lower areas. The big grocers are telling us that we don't have the roof tops to justify them locating there.

Carolyn Nelson asked about the public and private trail heads and if parking will be put in.

Jack Hepworth said if it will be public then parking would be put in.

Ed James said that that section of the Murdock Canal should be part of the trail system.

Jack Hepworth said that we have shown the existing rail trail and where it terminates. We would continue that trail up to where it connects with the Provo River Water and connect in above but we would still have to talk to Provo River Waters about using that as part of the trail system. If they will let us use that for pedestrian use then we will show it.

Janys Hutchings said she doesn't want anything on their concept that they don't control.

Lorin Powell said that they elected to go along SR-92 to our rail trail; it was a choice that the County and those people made. The rail trail goes on around and connects.

Jack Hepworth said that we would end up building roads over that; but it is out of our control.

Derek Byrne asked about showing a trail head up Central Canyon.

Jack Hepworth said he didn't feel comfortable designating that until there is further grading in that area; if it works we will do that. He also discussed notes 1 & 2 – should those school sites be purchased those units are forfeited not transferred.

Derek Byrne asked about the summary numbers not being tied to the cities vernacular.

Jack Hepworth said that what we had done is had the wrong densities listed with the wrong density numbers. We were getting feedback that we were leading people astray – so we tried to match the code as much as possible.

Derek Byrne asked staff about one of the letters that we had received before – he asked about having to have a stream alteration permit.

Kim Struthers said that in the original Area Plan there was an environmental study done; if there is any water up there it disappears pretty quickly in the ground or goes into a storm drainage system.

Lorin Powell mentioned the fire station. He said that about a year ago they decided to see where the stations are and how they could service the city. They incorporated the 5 minute response time. He said we do own the ground on the west side of the tracks and we have a map that shows the coverage area if a station goes in there. We have purchased the one on the west side from the school.

Kerry Schwartz asked about the parcel identified as potential park that was previously open space.

Jack Hepworth said that all he was saying is that in the Area Plan process there is a 'Parks' chapter that identifies the parks and what's public and what's private: how they're being built and how they're being paid for. A part of the impact fee analysis is to determine what the burden is on the system from the new growth. He said one group was more in favor of public and another group was more in favor of private recreation areas.

Marilyn Schiess asked about what is meant by an active park: grass, playground equipment, or what?

Jack Hepworth said that in the Lehi Code there are active and passive parks. We are required to have 10% of open space which can be active and/or passive and we are way over that amount. A park that is developed to have active uses would be an active park.

Marilyn Schiess asked about bigger park areas for when the kids grow up.

Jack Hepworth pointed out the larger park areas.

Kerry Schwartz reminded the public that the public hearing had been closed but asked the commission if they wanted to accept more comment.

Ed James said he feels like we have the feelings and desires from the public and doesn't feel we need to open it back up.

Kim Struthers said that there have been some that have asked if they could make additional comments.

Carolyn Player asked if they had a spokesperson – maybe just a couple people.

Marianne Ludlow was present and said that there has been a major change and they said in order to do that they would have to amend the Development Agreement. She said that in the meeting we said the density we want reduced is around the school and we talked about moving 250 units down where there was office space and they're adding 540 units of density. They had 1000 units of commercial with units above – so what they've done is eliminate their 'phantom' density and they are moving it to the ultra high density. They would have to amend the Development Agreement and we wanted that to be a flex area so the density could be moved down there. They took away the 1000 Highway Commercial units and they're

getting 540 units. The Planning Commission shouldn't allow it. It should be office space. She thinks it should be tabled so that can be looked at and there should be parks and the recreation center included.

Jack Hepworth said that the only reason that shows as flex is that is an opportunity. He said in the 6024 units there can be 540 units that aren't accounted for. The 6024 number will not increase but there may be a density transfer to that flex area. There is no increase. He said that the phasing plan shows that same area. The summary table says there was a 13 acre recreation area and when there were changes made before the approved Area Plan the church bought 5 acres. So it was never intended to be a 13 acre recreation area.

Kerry Schwartz said that from the discussions we've had we have received most of the information we've requested.

Ed James said that the purpose of this Concept Plan is to set the parameters for future Area Plans and he hasn't seen consistent numbers and directions we need to have thresholds identified and then we'll know what the bottom line is. We need to know density and amenities. He said he spent most of yesterday going through emails and the issues and comments.

Ed James moved to recommend approval of Mountain Homes Development's request for Concept Plan review for Traverse Mountain Planned Community, an approximate 2,700 acre master planned development located at approximately 3940 North Traverse Mountain Blvd in an existing Planned Community zone with a total density of up to 6024 units dispersed as per the submitted concept plan and the following recommendations: 1) the density amounts in West Canyon and Middle Canyon be reduced by 50% and reassigned to lower commercial areas. It is recommended that the City look into a density "buy down" over a twenty year period; 2) The Concept Plan should specifically identify areas (with acreage) of all proposed city parks and private parks (to be operated by the TMHOA). The total acreage of public parks is recommended at 75 acres. Private parks be no less than 20 acres of active/ passive parks, i.e. rec facilities, pool, tennis courts, etc. shall be built by the developer and given to the HOA as housing units are developed. The approximate 1,000 acres of open space identified in the Concept Plan, to be dedicated to the city for open space and passive recreation such as hiking; 3) The Concept Plan shall indicate conceptual nodes of community services such as fire, police, library, etc. within identified neighbor nodes so that residents may enjoy these services without long travel distances. Preferably one on Traverse Mountain Blvd between an existing church and Traverse Mountain Elementary School with another located on the easterly portion of the property. At least one other elementary school site shall be identified on the Concept Plan in addition to Traverse Mountain Elementary School; 4) Identify specific densities per area with numbers consistent with all legends using city nomenclature and color code; 5) Identify on the Concept Plan "no rent" zones where rental units (i.e. apartments) are prohibited by restricting "apartment building" or similar projects specifically designed for the rental market. Residential zones shall allow rental units in apartment-townhome configurations consistent with current HOA requirements; 6) The Concept Plan should further identify off-site west and east ingress/egress routes to accommodate future additional density. Any export of dirt, gravel and material must be to the west by conveyor and not through the residential streets of existing or proposed streets; 7) Prior to the approval of the Area Plan; a comprehensive Traffic Study is recommended to assess the design of existing and proposed roads in accommodating traffic for 6024 units in Traverse Mountain. In addition an environmental analysis should be part of the Area Plan's final plan on the impact of natural terrain, re-vegetation, animal habitat and endangerment to indigenous species shall be prepared for those areas of the conceptual plan that are in canyons, hillsides or areas of unique natural character; 8) Total density of the development should be modified based upon the findings and recommendation of the Traffic and Environmental studies; 9) A future TRAX station should be identified surrounded by land uses that support the utilization of this transportation mode. This motion is based upon the findings of fact that the Concept Plan along with the recommendations in this motion conforms to Chapter 6 – Planned

Community Zone, Section 06-060 1-2 of the City's Development Code and is consistent with the General Plan of the City. Second by Carolyn Player.

Kerry Schwartz asked about item #2 of the motion. He said there are several items (2, 4 & 5) that have all been taken care of. He asked in item #2 what does dedicated mean.

Ed James said that the discussion is whether the HOA or city takes care of it – it's dedicated to the city.

Kerry Schwarz said item #6 it mentions that it needs to accommodate future additional density.

Ed James said we are talking about the West Canyon with the density in the Area Plan and if the traffic study shows it can go through the residential areas then that's fine but he feels they will need some other access out of that area and we have talked about connecting and there should be an active discussion as to access to these areas.

Kerry Schwartz said that item #7 is not something we typically require from anybody.

Ed James said that in the amended contract between the developer and the city they have two factors: technical and environmental solutions.

Kerry Schwartz said that prior to the motion Ed said that the developer had not nailed down numbers and locations so #8 seems wishy-washy.

Ed James said that it would determine what the traffic study shows – there ought to be some fact for the density up the canyon.

Derek Byrne said that he has similar concerns on some of the items. He said that the Concept Plan before us already identifies #5. Item #6 has two things going on – he doesn't think that we would be able to pull the second half of that off.

Ed James said that they said that it would be taken out west by conveyor.

Lorin Powell said that it has to go west – not through the development but through Flight Park Road either by truck or conveyor.

Mark Johnson said the conveyor issue came up for the stuff coming out of Fox Canyon.

Derek Byrne said as it is he can't vote in favor of this.

Janys Hutchings has a concern on #1 and having 50% assigned to the lower commercial areas; she had heard that they don't want it down there.

Ed James said it can be done they just don't want to do it – it would be a more beneficial project if they would move the density. The density needs to be reduced from above the lower areas.

Kerry Schwartz said that he hopes that the residents here realize the changes that have been made from the Canyon Areas on the original plan.

Derek Byrne said that the language in #1 is a little difficult; Central Canyon wraps around over to West Canyon.

Discussed the density and the flex areas.

Roll call vote: Carolyn Player – yes, Marilyn Schiess - yes, Ed James - yes, Carolyn Nelson – yes, Derek Byrne – opposed, Janys Hutchings – opposed, Kerry Schwartz – opposed. Motion carried 4-3 as stated.

Kim Struthers said that the City Council meeting will be August 9th and it will be a public hearing but there will not be more letters mailed out.

DRAFT